

REMARKS

[0004] Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all of the claims of the application. Claims 1-4, 7-20, 22-24, and 39 are presently pending. Claims amended herein are 1, 12, 20, and 39.

Claim Rejections under § 103

[0005] Claims 1, 3-4, 7-20, 22-24 and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103. In light of the amendments presented herein and the decisions/agreements reached during the above-discussed Examiner interview, Applicant submits that these rejections are moot. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the § 103 rejections be withdrawn and the case be passed along to issuance.

[0006] The Examiner's rejections are based upon the following references alone or in combination:

- **Fields:** *Fields, et al.*, US Patent No. 6,128,655 (issued October 3, 2000);
- **Matsumoto:** *Matsumoto, et al.*, US Patent No. 6,763,334 (issued July 13, 2004);
- **Runge:** *Runge et al.*, US Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0016735 (Published February 7, 2002); and
- **Wildfire:** *Wildfire*, "FTP Tutorial: Using FTP Explorer", retrieved at <<http://web.archive.org/web/*/http://www.btinternet.com/~wildfire/articles/22.htm>> 12/16/2000, Wildfire, pp#1-pp#5.

Based upon Fields

[0007] The Examiner rejects claims 1, 3-4, 7-20 and 22-24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fields, in view of Mastumoto, in further view of Runge, and in further view of Wildfire. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of these claims and asks the Office to withdraw the rejection of these claims.

Independent Claims 1, 12, and 20

[0008] Independent claims 1, 12, and 20 are amended to include subject matter from the specification. Support for the amendments can be found in the specification at least at page 15 lines 14-17 and page 17 lines 8-14.

[0009] Claim 1, as amended, recites:

A computer executable method comprising:
periodically retrieving a media content from one or more of a plurality of content providers, the media content comprising actual media content, scheduling information, and contact information associated with the actual media content, wherein the retrieved media content is to be displayed in at least one Web page;
verifying a structure and syntax of the retrieved media content by comparing the retrieved media content with a schema file;
rejecting the media content if the media content is not valid;
and
if the media content is valid:
submitting the media content to a media content database;
periodically searching the media content database for a media content matching a display criteria;
extracting the matching media content from the media content database;
scheduling the matching media content to be displayed, the scheduling comprising;

a scheduled time for the display of matching media content,
a scheduled priority for the display of matching media content within a timeslice, and
a scheduled locale for the display of matching media content, wherein the scheduled locale indicates the country or geographic region in which the content is to be displayed;
publishing the matching media content in a file folder, the file folder name comprising the scheduled date and time; and
displaying the matching media content at the scheduled time by displaying each media content published to the file folder at the scheduled time.

[0010] Applicant submits that the cited documents do not disclose, teach or suggest all the features of claims 1, 12, and 20 because they do not disclose at least the following features as recited in these claims:

- “a scheduled priority for the display of matching media content within a timeslice,”
- “a scheduled locale for the display of matching media content, wherein the scheduled locale indicates the country or geographic region in which the content is to be displayed”

[0011] As agreed during the interview, the cited documents do not disclose, teach, or suggest “a schedule priority” or a “scheduled locale” within the context of scheduling the display of media content within a website. The Office admits Fields “does not specifically teach scheduling said content for publishing at a scheduled time.” (Office Action, pg. 5). The Office cites Matsumoto as teaching the “scheduling [of] the matching media content to be displayed” by disclosing “arranging delivery of advertisements over the internet, whereby an ad banner campaign is negotiated for a start and end period of time of published ads.”

(Office Action, pg. 5). The Office agreed the cited documents are limited to disclosing time scheduling and fail to teach or suggest “a scheduled priority for the display of matching media content within a timeslice” and “a scheduled locale for the display of matching media content within the schedule locale indicates the country or geographic region in which the content is to be displayed.” Accordingly, Applicant asks the Office to withdraw the rejection of these claims.

Dependent Claims 2-4, 7-11, 13-19, and 22-25

[0012] Claims 2-4, 7-11, 13-19, and 22-25 ultimately depend from independent claims 1, 12, or 20. As discussed above, claims 1, 12, and 20 are allowable. Thus, claims 2-4, 7-11, 13-19, and 22-25 are allowable by virtue of this dependency, as well as for additional features that they recite.

Independent Claim 39

[0013] Independent claim 39 is amended to include subject matter from the specification. Support for the amendments can be found in the specification at least at page 15 lines 14-17 and page 17 lines 8-14.

[0014] Claim 39, as amended, recites:

A computer executable method comprising:
periodically retrieving a media content from one or more of a plurality of content providers, wherein the retrieved media content is to be displayed in at least one Web page;
verifying a format of the retrieved media content by comparing a data structure of the retrieved media content with a data structure defined in a schema file;
rejecting the media content if a format of the media content is not valid; and
if the media content is valid:
submitting the media content to a media content database;

periodically searching the media content database for a media content matching a display criteria;

extracting the matching media content from the media content database;

scheduling the matching media content to be displayed at a scheduled time, a scheduled priority, and a scheduled locale, wherein scheduling the matching media content includes creating a multi-level directory structure associated with the scheduled time, the scheduled priority, and the scheduled locale; and

displaying the matching media content at the scheduled time, in the scheduled priority, and in the scheduled locale, the matching media content being displayed by a Web server.

[0015] Applicant submits that the cited documents do not disclose, teach or suggest all the features of claim 39 because they do not disclose at least the following features as recited in this claim:

- “scheduling the **matching media content to be displayed at a scheduled time, a scheduled priority, and a scheduled locale**”

[0016] As agreed during the interview, the cited documents do not disclose, teach, or suggest “a schedule priority” or a “scheduled locale” within context of scheduling the display of media content within a website. The Office admits Fields “does not specifically teach scheduling said content for publishing at a scheduled time.” (Office Action, pg. 5). The Office cites Matsumoto as teaching the “scheduling [of] the matching media content to be displayed” by disclosing “arranging delivery of advertisements over the internet, whereby an ad banner campaign is negotiated for a start and end period of time of published ads.” (Office Action, pg. 5). However, the Office agreed the cited documents fail to teach or suggest “scheduling the matching **media content to be displayed at**

a scheduled time, a scheduled priority, and a scheduled locale.”

Accordingly, Applicant asks the Office to withdraw the rejection of this claim.

Conclusion

[0017] All pending claims are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt issuance of the application. If any issues remain that prevent issuance of this application, the **Examiner is urged to contact me before issuing a subsequent Action**. Please call or email me at your convenience.

Respectfully Submitted,

Lee & Hayes, PLLC
Representatives for Applicant

/Dominic S. Lindauer/ Dated: 3/16/09
Dominic S. Lindauer (dominic@leehayes.com; (509) 944-4729)
Registration No. 61,417
Customer No. **22801**

Telephone: (509) 324-9256
Facsimile: (509) 323-8979
www.leehayes.com